



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,572	03/31/2004	Hong Zhou	0026-0080	4333
44989	7590	06/25/2008		
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030			EXAMINER NOFAL, CHRISTOPHER P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2169	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/813,572

Applicant(s)

ZHOU ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher P. Nofal

Art Unit

2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2007 and 17 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 12, 14-18, 21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 12, 14-16 and 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 18 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/6/2008, 8/14/2007
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment, filed 7/2/2007, has been received, entered into the record, and considered.
2. As a result of the amendment, claims 1, 3 –6, 12, 14, 16 – 18, 21, and 22 have been amended. Claims 10, 13, 19, and 20 have been cancelled.
3. Applicant's response, filed 12/17/2007, to the Non-Responsive Amendment, has been received, entered into the record, and considered.
4. Claims 1 –9, 11, 12, 14 – 18, 21, and 22 remain pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statements

5. The information disclosure statements, filed on 3/6/2008 and 8/14/2007, have been received and entered into the record. Since the information disclosure statements comply with the provisions of MPEP § 609, the Examiner has considered the references cited therein. See attached forms PTO-1449.

Response to Arguments

6. In view of the incorporation of allowable subject matter from objected claim 10, claims 1 – 9, 11, 12, and 14 – 16 are allowed over the cited prior art.
7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/2/2007 regarding claims 17, 18, and 21, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
8. Regarding claim 18, applicant argues in substance on page 13 of the remarks that **Bowman** does not disclose or suggest that the table is a dictionary of word or phrases. The Examiner respectfully responds that "During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their

terms reasonably allow.” *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1834 (Fed. Cir. 2004). In the context of computer related inventions, a dictionary is sbroadly referred to as a data structure “made up of associations” (See “**Gasp Python Course J. Jargon**”). Thus, it is reasonable for one of ordinary skill in the art to construe the correlation table of Bowman to be a dictionary of words or phrases.

9. Regarding claim 18, applicant argues in substance the Examiner fails to address the feature of “using an inverse frequency technique or a linguistic modeling technique.” The Examiner, however, respectfully responds that the current claim language only requires that the Examiner show only “one of” the determination methods.

10. Applicant argues in substance on page 16 that claim 17 is in condition for allowance because it includes the allowable features of claim 1. However, the Examiner never indicated any allowable features in previously presented claim 1.

11. Applicant’s response, filed 12/17/2007, to the Examiner’s Request for Information under 37 CFR 1.105 has been received. Although Examiner has considered applicant’s reply and the information provided therein, the information provided by applicant has not been used for the purposes of the prior art rejections made in this Office action.

12. Examiner suggests applicant further amend the claims to highlight the differences between the cited prior art and applicant’s claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

14. **Claim 17** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bowman (US 6,006,225)** in view of **Google Hacks (February 2003)**.

15. **As per claim 17, Bowman** discloses a system comprising:

a memory (Fig. 1)

a processor connected to the memory (Fig. 1) to:

receive a search query (Col 3 lines 5-9);

determine whether the received search query includes an entity name (Col 6 lines 59-64);

determine whether the entity name corresponds to a common word or phrase (Col 6 line 64- Col 7 line 5 and col 7 lines 24-33);

rewrite the received search query to obtain a rewritten search query (Figure 7: shows if there are no terms in the correlation table then no rewrite is performed) **when it is determined that the received search query includes an entity name that does not correspond to a common word or phrase** (Col 6 line 64- Col 7 line 5 and col 7 lines 24-33; also, Fig. 9).

Bowman does not explicitly disclose the feature of “the rewritten query including a restrict identifier that restricts a search associated with the rewritten search domain associate with the entity name.” However, in an analogous art, this feature is disclosed on page 54 of **Google Hacks**. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate this feature into the teachings of **Bowman** because it provides the advantage of providing new search results and cached pages that are no longer available on the site itself.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
17. **Claims 18 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Bowman (US 6,006,225)**.
18. **As per claim 18, Bowman** discloses a method, comprising:
determining a plurality of entity names (Col 6 lines 59-64);
determining whether each of the entity names corresponds to one of a plurality of common words or phrases (Col 6 line 64- Col 7 line 5 and col 7 lines 24-33; also, Fig. 9)
by one of:
comparing each of the entity names to a dictionary of words or phrases (Figure 7; Fig. 5a); and
generating a table of the entity names that correspond to the common words or phrases (Figure 5a, Col 2 lines 47-63).
19. **Claim 21** is the system claim corresponding to method claim 18. Thus claim 21 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 18.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 – 9, 11, 12, 14 – 16, and 22 are allowed over the cited prior art.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, fails to teach in combination with the other claim limitations, the combined features of: rewriting the received search query to include a restrict identifier that restricts a search based on the rewritten search query to a domain associated with the entity name when the entity name is determined not to correspond to one of the common words or phrases; performing a search based on the or the rewritten search query to obtain search results when the received search query is rewritten; and presenting the search results when the search is performed based on the rewritten search query, as recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 22.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2169

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher P. Nofal whose telephone number is (571)270-3161. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pierre M. Vital can be reached on (571) 272-4215. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

2-Jun-08

/Christopher P. Nofal/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169

**/JEAN B. FLEURANTIN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162**

**/Pierre M. Vital/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169**